

Mid-Atlantic DER Workshop Philadelphia, PA

PJM Demand Response Programs

Lynn Horning
Market Development
PJM Interconnection
February 21, 2002





- 2001-2002 Program Highlights
- 2002 Program Activities
- Fundamental Differences/Issues
- Future Goals





- Sum m er 2001 pilot program contained two separate pieces:
 - -Emergency option
 - -Economic option



2001-2002 Emergency Option

- Participation required PJM membership –
 non-PJM Members could:
 - apply for special membership in PJM or
 - participate through another member
- Those customers already participating in ALM program with energy supplier or distribution company are NOT eligible while ALM is in effect.
- PJM paid higher of Zonal IMP or \$500/MWh
 formetered reductions
- Charges allocated in the same manner as emergency purchases





- Customer's LSE charged LMP for reductions
- LSE credited customer's retail rate
- Difference credited to the party that signed the load reduction up with PJM



2001-2002 Economic Option



Requirements:

- must be a full PJM member to participate
- customers must be able to meter reductions on an hourly basis
- ALM customers may participate when ALM obligations are not active

As a result:

- customer decides when to reduce based on their own economic factors
- no notification from PJM
- no floor price
- no costs to "socialize" because settlement is a zero-sum calculation

2001 Statistics



- Total participation: 220 MW
 - 150 MW Emergency
 - 70 MW Economic
 - 164 M W also in ALM programs
- 50 Customer sites
 - 21 Companies
 - 11 submitting entities
- Actual Load Response Events
 - Emergency: July 25th, August 8th and 9th
 - Additional economic responses on August 7^{th} and 10^{th}

2001 Statistics



- July 25th event: 18 sites responded for approximately 22M W
- August 8th event: 29 sites responded for approximately 20M W
- August 9th event: 30 sites responded for approximately 63M W
- All reductions are in addition to those counted under the existing ALM program.



- Demand-Side Response Task Force (DSRTF) created by the PJM Members Committee
 - DSRTF charge was to determine principles by which a demand side program should operate
 - These principles were approved by the MC on October 4, 2001
- Demand-Side Response Working Group was then formed under the Energy Market Committee to design a program according to those principles

PJM

Fundamental Differences/Issues

- Payment to load reducers
 - Full LMP
 - LMP minus the customer's retail rate
- Collection of program costs
 - Charge to LSE
 - Allocate to load
- Minimum LMP for participation -\$30 or \$100
- Program length 2 or 3 years
- Average days for CBL calculation



2002-2003 Emergency Program

- Emergency program close to 2001-2002 program
 - Maintains Special membership
 - Maintains floor price
 - Allocates costs same as emergency
 - Permanent program reviewed yearly by Market Monitor
 - Less restrictions on ALM parties
- 25 MW non-interval meter customer program

Emergency program approved by PJM Members Committee February 14, 2002



2002 - 2003 Economic Proposals

- Multiple Proposals for an Economic Program
- All proposals include Real Time and Day Ahead options

PJM Demand Side Response Working Group Still Trying to Reach Consensus on the Issues



• Long Term Goal: Develop a fungible, tradable demand response product

• Short Term Goal: Develop a solution where certain elements, like subsidies and allocation of costs, may be necessary





- The desired end state is for price signals to be sufficient motivators for demand response
- Any economic program would be an interim step toward the end state
- Such an interim step may need to include a subsidy to spur demand response
- The interim step should only be applicable for the short-term, until the long-term solution can be developed and implemented



Questions????